

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

In response to the interview conducted on June 9, 2009 between the Examiner and the Applicants' attorney, the Applicants submit the following summary.

During the interview, the Applicants' attorney stated that it was the Applicants' position that the Examiner's 102(b) rejection of claims 1-10 is improper due to the fact the prior art relied upon does not disclose each and every element of the present claims. Specifically, the Applicants' attorney argued that the step of mixing in the prior art mixes two end products, rather than four reactants as presently claimed, which does not satisfy the requirements of a proper 102(b) rejection. The Examiner opined that so long as each claimed component was mixed with the other claimed components at some point in time, the prior art relied upon anticipated the present claims. The Applicants' attorney stated that the components of the prior art are mixed after a reaction occurs, and thus the claimed components themselves are not being mixed in the prior art. In response, the Examiner recommended a clarifying amendment, such as "simultaneous mixing" or "one step reaction" to overcome the prior art.